

Serial No. 10/015,369

Page 7 of 11

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Applicants amend claims 1-7 and 10 for clarification. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner maintained that Fig. 2 should be designated by the caption "Prior Art" because its corresponding description could only be found in the background section of the specification. Applicants point out, again, to the Examiner that such description only refers to Fig. 2 as an "assumed configuration" to illustrate improvements and problems identified by Applicants and solved by the claimed invention. Applicants refer the Examiner to MPEP § 608.01(c), which states that the Background section of an application may include "the problems involved in the prior art or other information disclosed which are solved by the applicant's invention..." The recognition and description of such problems and "other information," which is "known to the applicant," included for illustrating problems solved by the claimed invention are not, themselves, admitted as prior art. And MPEP § 608.01(c) clearly provides for the inclusion of such "other information" distinct from admitted "prior art." Applicants also refer to MPEP § 2129, which requires an applicant's explicit statement identifying the work of another as "prior art" for all admissions of prior art. Again, Applicants merely illustrate their own work in Fig. 2 on possible ways to improve existing techniques, and therefore, have not admitted such portions of the application as prior art work of another. Accordingly, Applicants, again, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to Fig. 2.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,606 to Ekman et al.; claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of

84195542_1.DOC

Serial No. 10/015,369

Page 8 of 11

Ekman et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,925 to Tauchi; claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tauchi; claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,798,844 to Ratto; and claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,038,404 to Marz. Applicants amend the claims in a good faith effort to clarify the invention as distinguished from the cited references, and respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Examiner, again, maintained that Fig. 2 should be considered prior art. And Applicants, again, point out to the Examiner that the “assumed configuration” illustrated in Fig. 2 of the application has not been admitted by Applicants to be prior art work of another. An “assumed configuration” by Applicants may be improved upon by the claimed invention, and such improvement does not render the “assumed configuration” to be prior art. Thus, further to the above comments, Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 2 and its corresponding description in the application is not AAPA, and request that the Examiner withdraw the claim rejections for at least this reason.

Furthermore, Ekman et al. describe the objective of providing selectable amplification by selecting between amplifier branches. Indeed, as conceded by the Examiner, Ekman et al. describe a switch used to select an amplifier branch to thereby save on operation time of a battery. And, therefore, Ekman et al., as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, do not suggest—and, in fact, teach away from—an output of one of the modulation units that are included in the first and second transmission amplifier units being fed commonly to the main

84195542_1.DOC

Serial No. 10/015,369

Page 9 of 11

amplifiers included in the first and second transmission amplifier units, as claimed. Applicants

amend the claims to more clearly recite the features of the claimed invention.

Fig. 2 of the present application also do not illustrate or suggest either of elements 32-1 and 32-2 being fed commonly to elements 10-1 and 10-2.

As such, even assuming, arguendo, that the proposed combination of references was proper, such a combination would still have failed to disclose or suggest,

“[a] parallel operation system of transmission amplifiers, comprising:

first and second transmission amplifier units which receive a common input signal and output amplified signals from respective ones; and

a coupling unit which combines outputs of the first and second transmission units, to provide as its output;

the first and second transmission amplifier units each including:

a main amplifier; and

a modulation unit disposed on the input side of the main amplifier; wherein

the output of either one of the modulation units included in the first and second transmission amplifier units is fed commonly to the main amplifiers included in the first and second transmission amplifier units,” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, together with claims 2 and 7 dependent therefrom, is patentable over AAPA and Ekman et al., separately and in combination, for at least the foregoing reasons. Claim 3 incorporates features that correspond to those claim 1, and is, therefore, together with claims 4-6 dependent therefrom, patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons. The Examiner relied upon Tauchi, Rättö, and Marz as combining references to specifically address the additional features of claims 8-11, which also incorporate features that correspond to those of claims 1 and 3. The Examiner, again, relied upon Fig. 2 of the application as the principal reference, AAPA, in rejecting these claims. And

84195542_1.DOC

Serial No. 10/015,369

Page 10 of 11

Applicants, again, submit that Fig. 2 is not AAPA. Thus, Tauchi, Rättö, and Marz would have failed to cure the above-described deficiencies of the references cited against claims 1-7 even assuming, arguendo, that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to combine them in the manner proposed by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-11 are patentable over the cited references for at least the above-stated reasons.

Applicants did not “skip” the rejections of the dependent claims, but established that they are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as those for their respective base claims.

Regarding claim 2, Ekman et al. only describe one of the parallel amplifier branches being output through switch 103—please see, c.g., Fig. 1 thereof. As such, even assuming, arguendo, that the proposed combination of references was proper, such a combination would still have failed to disclose or suggest,

“a switch interposed between the main amplifier and the modulation unit included in each of the first and second transmission amplifier units; the switch being changed over to feed the output of either one of the modulation units included in the first and second transmission amplifiers commonly to the main amplifiers included in the first and second transmission amplifier units,” as recited in claim 2. (Emphasis added)

Regarding claim 11, the cited portions of Marz only include description of first and second references for respective phase lock loops for a cable TV up converter. Thus, even assuming, arguendo, that the proposed combination of references was proper, such a combination would still have failed to disclose or suggest,

“[a] parallel operation system of transmission amplifiers, comprising:

84195542_1.DOC

Serial No. 10/015,369

Page 11 of 11

first and second systems each having a pre-distorter which receives analog signals, having an up-converter which multiplies the output of the pre-distorter up to a predetermined frequency, and having a main amplifier which amplifies the output of the up-converter;

a coupling unit which combines the outputs of the main amplifiers of the first and second systems; and

a feedback system including a down-converter which reduces the output of the coupling unit into a predetermined frequency, wherein

a common reference signal is fed to both the up-converter and the down-converter, and wherein


the output of the down-converter included in the feedback system is fed back to the pre-distorters of the first and second systems, and wherein

the pre-distorters of the first and second systems create distortion anticipated values of the main amplifiers as a function of the fed back output level of the coupling unit and add them to the inputted analog signals, for output," as recited in claim 11.
(Emphasis added)

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Dexter T. Chang
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-6384
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: 100794-00105 (FUJH 19.249)
DTC:bf

84195542_1.DOC